DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 160 248 PS 010 176

AUTHOR	Morris, Mary; Smith, Allen
TITLE	Project Developmental Continuity Evaluation: Site Visitors' Manual.
INSTITUTION	Development Associates, Inc., Arlington, Va.; High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, Ypsilanti, Mich.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Child Development (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Early Childhood Research and Evaluation Branch.
PUB DATE	77
CONTRACT	HEW-105-75-1114
NOTE	59p.; For related documents, see ED 144 715, and PS 010 163-175; This series includes all the public reports generated by this study
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Compensatory Education; Data Collection; *Demonstration Programs; *Early Childhood Education; *Evaluation Criteria; *Guidelines; Interviews; Manuals; Preschool Education; Primary Education; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; *School Visitation; Site Analysis
IDENTIFIERS	*Developmental Continuity; Implementation Rating Instrument; *Project Developmental Continuity; Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

This site visitors' manual is part of a series of documents on the evaluation of Project Developmental Continuity (PDC), a Head Start demonstration program aimed at providing educational and developmental continuity between children's Head Start and primary school experiences. The PDC evaluation documents and analyzes the process of program development and implementation, and the impact of program outcomes on the social competence of children, on teachers, parents, and on institutions involved in the program. The purpose of the winter 1977 visit is to collect data from sites on implementation activities in the third year of PDC. The manual consists of 5 sections. A general introduction to the PDC evaluation and purpose of the site visit is followed by section II, which describes the general procedures to be followed on the visit, the division of labor, and arrangements that should be made before the visit. Section III presents interview forms and techniques which may be used as a guide to conservation with the PDC staff, principals, teachers, and parents. Section IV outlines the Implementation Rating Instrument (IRI) and its use. Specific types of objective IRI items are listed with instructions for scoring each type. Definitions for key IRI items are also included. Section V describes post-visit writing requirements for Development Associates staff and High/Scope team members who will be involved in the site visit. A detailed format outline for the site reports is included. (CM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Project Developmental Continuity Evaluation

ED160248

PS010176

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John M. Love

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Site Visitors' Manual

Winter 1977

PROJECT DEVELOPMENTAL CONTINUITY EVALUATION

Site Visitors' Manual

Winter 1977

Prepared by:

Mary Morris
Allen Smith

High/Scope Educational Research Foundation
600 North River Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

and

Development Associates Inc.
1521 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

John M. Love, Project Director
High/Scope Educational Research Foundation

This manual was prepared for use under Office of Child Development, HEW, Contract No. HEW-105-75-1114, Dr. Esther Kresh, Project Officer.

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION.	1
	An Overview of Project Developmental Continuity (PDC).	1
	Purpose of the PDC Evaluation	3
	Purpose of this Site Visit.	4
II.	GENERAL SITE VISIT PROCEDURES	6
	Team Composition and Roles.	6
	Pre-visit Arrangements.	9
	Individual Preparation Prior to the Visit	9
	Initial On-site Team Meeting.	9
	Opening Meeting (Monday Morning).	10
	Final Meeting with Site Personnel (Friday).	10
III.	THE INTERVIEW FORMS	13
	Purpose	13
	Types of Interview Forms.	13
	Instructions for Administering the Interview Forms.	15
	Comparison Program Interview Forms.	17
IV.	THE IMPLEMENTATION RATING INSTRUMENT.	19
	IRI Construction.	19
	How IRI Data Will Be Used	20
	How and When to Complete the IRI.	20
	How to Score IRI Objective Items.	21
	Types of Objective IRI Items.	23
	How to Score the IRI Judgmental Scales.	26
	Definitions for Key IRI Terms	32
V.	REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.	35
	Writing Responsibilities for High/Scope Staff . . .	35
	Writing Responsibilities for DA Staff	40
	Outline for PDC Site Reports.	41

I

INTRODUCTION

An Overview of Project Developmental Continuity (PDC)

The Office of Child Development originated Project Developmental Continuity (PDC) in 1974 as a Head Start demonstration program "aimed at promoting greater continuity of education and comprehensive child development services for children as they make the transition from preschool to school." The single most important effect of this undertaking, it is hoped, will be to enhance the social competence of the children served--that is, to increase their everyday effectiveness in dealing with their environment (at school, at home, in the community, and in society).

As part of the overall Head Start Improvement and Innovation effort, PDC emphasizes the involvement of administrators, classroom staff, and parents in formulating educational goals and developing a comprehensive curriculum. The object of this effort is to ensure that children receive continuous individualized attention as they progress from Head Start through the early primary grades. Existing discontinuities between Head Start and elementary school experiences will be reduced, if the program is successful, by PDC mechanisms which encourage communication and mutual decision-making among preschool and elementary school teachers, administrators, and parents.

Two program models provide alternative ways of establishing the administrative structure for continuity. In the Preschool-School Linkages approach, administratively separate Head Start and elementary programs are brought together by the device of a PDC Council, whose membership includes teachers, parents, and administrators from both organizations. In the Early Childhood Schools approach, Head Start and elementary programs are combined both administratively, by the Council, and physically, in the same building, creating a new institution. In both approaches a qualitatively different program is expected to emerge as a result of the Head Start-elementary school cooperation.

Continuity is expected to be established in two contexts: that of the individual child and that of the school structure. In the first context, continuity means, for example, that a child should not have to have his or her personal nature and needs rediscovered each year as he or she moves from one grade to the next; instead the child should become a more and more fully recognized member of the school "family" as time passes. In the context of school structure, continuity implies cooperative pursuit of common goals, and this involves articulation of philosophies and methods in all the various areas of school enterprise. It is expected that structural continuity will contribute directly to continuity in the attention given to individual children.

School organizations at fifteen sites around the country received OCD funding during 1974-1975 (Program Year I) to design and plan implementation of the seven prescribed components of PDC. The components focus respectively on:

- coordination of curriculum approaches and educational goals;
- parent participation in policy-making, home-school activities, and classroom visits or volunteering;
- comprehensive services (medical, nutritional and social) to children and families;
- preservice and inservice teacher training and child-rearing training for parents;
- programs for bilingual/bicultural or multicultural children;
- services for handicapped children and children with learning disabilities;
- administrative coordination between and within Head Start and elementary school.

During Year II, 1975-1976, fourteen sites (one withdrew voluntarily), comprising a total of 42 Head Start centers and elementary schools, implemented PDC according to the plans they drew up during Year I, tested their adaptations of the program and made adjustments where necessary. In Year III, 1976-1977, PDC is expected to be in mature form at the participating

sites, and a decision will be made to maintain or modify OCD support for the entire demonstration program. The decision will be based in large part on consideration of the feasibility of evaluating PDC's effects on children's development over a long term. If the program is continued, it will be for a five-year period, from 1976 to 1981, during which its effects will be observed as the children progress from Head Start through grade 3.

Purpose of the PDC Evaluation

The purpose of the PDC evaluation is to aid the Office of Child Development in the development of effective programs for early childhood education. It attempts to do this by documenting and analyzing the process of program development and implementation and by evaluating program outcomes, or the impact of the program on the social competence of children, on teachers and parents, and on the institutions involved in the programs.

The process evaluation includes:

- Descriptive data on the process of program planning, development and implementation at each site;
- Assessment of the degree to which implementation occurs;
- Assessment of program costs;
- Analysis of compliance with Head Start performance standards and PDC guidelines (Year I only);
- Formulation of hypotheses relating levels of implementation with the process of program planning and development.

The outcome or impact evaluation includes assessment of:

- Child development outcomes ("social competence")[1];
- Impact on PDC staff, teachers and administrators;

---

[1]Social competence is defined by the Office of Child Development as the child's "everyday effectiveness in dealing with his environment and responsibilities in school and life."

- Changes in parent perceptions and attitudes;
- Changes in the institutions and their relationships.

Although the evaluation is concerned with both the implementation process and outcomes of the program, during the first two years the emphasis was clearly on process. Even with the extensive testing of children carried out in the third year, the predominant flavor of the three-year effort is that of a process evaluation that analyzes relationships between process and implementation status, and increases the potential for explaining implementation successes and failures. A major impact evaluation study, if feasible, would be undertaken during the four years following this study, when outcomes can be assessed longitudinally as children proceed through the elementary grades.

Purpose of this Site Visit

The winter 1977 site visit will be our only opportunity to collect data from sites on implementation activities in Program Year III of PDC. Consequently, information collected this time will be relevant to all areas of the Implementation Study. Specifically, the visit has five objectives:

- to obtain Implementation Rating Instrument (IRI) profiles for each PDC program;
- to obtain the information needed for Development Associates to prepare separate reports describing in detail each PDC program;
- to "test" a set of hypotheses formulated last year that relate programs' levels of implementation to local factors, events, or circumstances;
- to obtain some data on the nature of the programs in comparison schools and Head Start centers;
- to help sites with the Cost Study data collection system.

This manual has five sections. Following this introduction, Section II describes the general procedures to be followed on the visit, the division of labor, and arrangements that should be made before the visit. The interview forms and techniques are detailed in Section III. Section IV outlines the Implementation Rating Instrument and its use. Reporting requirements for both High/Scope's and Development Associate's team members are defined in Section V.

II

GENERAL SITE VISIT PROCEDURES

Team Composition and Roles

Four-person teams will visit each site.[1] In some cases these teams will consist of two High/Scope and two DA staff and in other cases of one High/Scope and three DA staff. The PDC coordinators have received a list identifying the various people we need to interview and a suggested interview schedule that matches each team member with certain interviews. This suggested schedule is shown in Figures 1 and 2. For example, we suggested that the coordinator assign Team Member A (TM-A), (who will generally be the most familiar with the site and the IRI) the administration component interview, the education component interview, the PDC Council chairperson interview and some of the teacher interviews. TM-B will be interviewing comparison principals and Head Start directors using the Comparison Program Interview. All of this scheduling is, of course, tentative based on what the PDC coordinator can arrange and it is unlikely that it will go as smoothly as the suggested outline indicates. In the event that schedules conflict, e.g., the administration and education component interviews are scheduled at the same time, you will have to arrange your schedules accordingly. The identification of TM's A-D will be made prior to the training session.

According to the tentative schedule all team members except TM-D will be involved in completing the IRI. As mentioned earlier, TM-D will be responsible for interviewing all the comparison elementary school principals and Head Start directors plus some of the parents. Thus, if things go as scheduled this person will have little input in the IRI ratings. Things rarely go as planned, though; conflicts in the interview schedule will almost certainly force TM-D to conduct some other interviews. In that case he or she would have more of a role in IRI ratings.

---

[1]Because of the small number of PDC and comparison schools at the Texas and Georgia sites, three-member teams are sufficient.

Figure 1

Suggested Interview Assignments

(These assignments were suggested to coordinators; the actual schedules may vary.)

TM-A

- Administration Component
- Education Component (with TM-B)
- PDC Council Chairperson
- Teacher Interviews
- Comparison Interviews (Texas only)

TM-B

- Developmental Support Services Component
- Education Component (with TM-A)
- Handicapped Services Component
- Teacher Interviews

TM-C

- Parent Involvement Component
- Bilingual/Bicultural Component
- Parent Interviews

TM-D

- Comparison Program Interviews
- Parent Interviews

Figure 2

Suggested Site Visit Schedule*

		Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
TM-A	AM	Entrance Meeting	Education Component	(Teachers)	Continue IRI Ratings	Final Meeting
	PM	Administration Component (Teachers)	PDC Council Chairperson Interview (Teachers)	Continue IRI Ratings (Teachers)	Complete IRI Ratings	
TM-B	AM	Entrance Meeting	Education Component	Handicapped Component (Teachers)	Continue IRI Ratings	Final Meeting
	PM	Developmental Support Services Component (Teachers)	(Teachers)	Continue IRI Ratings (Teachers)	Complete IRI Ratings	
TM-C	AM	Entrance Meeting	(Parents)	Monitor Cost Analysis (Parents)	Continue IRI Ratings	
	PM	Parent Involvement Component (Parents)	BL/BC and/or Multicultural Component (Parents)	Continue IRI Ratings (Parents)	Complete IRI Ratings	
TM-D	AM	Entrance Meeting	(Comparison Programs) (Parents)	(Comparison Programs) (Parents)	(Comparison Programs) (Parents)	
	PM	Call Administrators (Comparison Programs) (Parents)	(Comparison Programs) (Parents)	(Comparison Programs) (Parents)	(Comparison Programs) (Parents)	
All Team Members (Evenings)		Team Meeting to Discuss the Day's Activities	Review Manual and IRI Rating Instrument Begin IRI Ratings	IRI Ratings	IRI Ratings	

*Parentheses indicate interviews to be scheduled for any available times.

Pre-visit Arrangements

Arrangements concerning the dates of the site visits were made in November and each site received a mailing in early January which again outlined the week's work and contained 1) the suggested schedule, 2) a form for the coordinator to use when scheduling interviews, 3) a list of randomly selected teachers to be interviewed, 4) copies of all but the parent interview forms to be distributed to the interviewees prior to our visit, and 5) copies of a letter to parents describing the parent interview forms. We hope that by having the interview forms in advance individuals will be able to prepare for the interview.

Early in the week prior to each site visit the team leader (TM-A) should call the coordinator to confirm the week's visit, check to see if he or she has scheduled all of the necessary interviews, and set up a time for the initial meeting on Monday. The team members should also be identified at this time.

Individual Preparation Prior to the Visit

Preparation for the visit is very important and will be two-phased: 1) group training--the interview forms and IRI will be introduced and will become familiar to all site visitors during the PDC group training session scheduled for High/Scope camp and 2) individual preparation--each of you will need to spend some time prior to the visits familiarizing yourself with the sites and their progress/status in each component area. Therefore, before each site visit, read through each of the "most knowledgeable" person interviews and make notes that will help you comment on past progress. You will need to use the background notebooks that have been prepared for this. This preparation will keep the interviewees from having to repeat information they have already provided two or three times and will help you refresh your memory of site operations.

Initial On-site Team Meeting

Each team should meet at their motel at about 8:00 p.m. on Sunday night. This time should be used to discuss what you already know about the site and the schedule for the week's activities. Team members who have been at the site before can brief the others on the role various people have

played in PDC locally, what to expect in interviews, etc. The factors that have affected the program's progress over the years should also be discussed at this time.

Opening Meeting (Monday Morning)

The entire team will meet with the coordinator Monday morning. We have suggested that the coordinators invite their staff to this meeting so they can meet the site visitors and get briefed on the objectives and activities for the week. After these introductions are complete, use the rest of the morning to work out the interview schedule.

Final Meeting with Site Personnel (Friday)

The last activity scheduled for the team visit is a group interview with the PDC coordinator and other key PDC staff he or she wishes to have present, such as component specialists and school and Head Start administrators. The intent of the meeting is to get the PDC staff to talk about factors or variables they see as influencing (either positively or negatively) their efforts to implement PDC. You could view this as a "lesson learned" session in which the staff express their views about the process of implementing a program such as PDC.

To get the discussion started, we have selected 11 of the more general hypotheses formulated last year. These are listed in Figure 3 (which you can tear out and take with you to the meeting). Don't read each hypothesis to the group, but raise their contents as an issue for discussion. For example, you might ask, "What was the relationship between the Head Start center(s) and elementary school(s) prior to PDC, and how did this earlier relationship affect your efforts to implement the program?" As people respond to this question you will get some sense of the extent to which the relevant hypotheses are supported at your site.

Once discussion begins, you should act as facilitators and recorders. Probe for factors that have shaped implementation; if someone refers obliquely to an event or circumstance that helped or hindered their program, pursue it. We'd like for you to come out of this discussion with three things:

- some information on the nature and extent of support for the hypotheses in Figure 3;

Figure 3

Hypotheses to Guide Friday Discussions

The Nature and Effects of Prior Head Start-Elementary School Relationships

Sites with a history of joint Head Start and elementary school administration by the school district will have higher levels of implementation than sites at which Head Start and elementary programs have been administered separately.

Sites where participating Head Start and elementary school programs have historically been housed in the same building will have higher levels of implementation than those where the two program have been housed separately.

Sites where the continuity of educational experiences has been stressed from Head Start classes through grade three will have higher implementation levels in all areas than sites where such continuity has not been stressed.

Pre-existing Priorities, Policies, Laws, and Programs

Sites with pre-existing or concurrent philosophies, legislation or programs similar to those required by PDC will have higher implementation in the component areas involved.

The Planning Process

Sites at which teachers, parents, and administrators were involved in the planning year activities will have higher implementation levels in all component areas.

Sites which adopted a plan in the first two months of Year II for sequential implementation of PDC requirements will have higher implementation levels overall than those which attempted to achieve full implementation immediately.

The Teacher Selection Process

Sites with formal selection/recruitment procedures for PDC teachers will have the highest levels of implementation in all component areas.

Sites where teachers could opt for or against participating within the PDC program while still remaining in the school will have slightly lower levels of implementation in all component areas.

Sites where teachers were given the choice of participating in PDC or transferring to another school will have lower levels of implementation in all component areas.

Sites where teachers were given no option as to participating in PDC will have the lowest levels of implementation in all component areas.

Division of Labor and Responsibilities

Sites at which the implementation of each component is assigned to a particular individual will have higher implementation in the components so assigned.

Sites at which a specific individual is responsible for the implementation of a given component at both the Head Start and elementary levels will have higher implementation in the component areas so assigned.

- a list of any additional factors that participants feel have shaped their program;

- a list of the "lessons learned" by the staff from their PDC experience.

This is an informal interview and its length will depend upon the amount of reflection/hypothesizing/etc. the PDC staff does. One High/Scope and one DA staff should attend this meeting.

III

THE INTERVIEW FORMS

Purpose

The interview forms are to guide your conversations with the PDC staff, principals, teachers and parents. They were designed to (1) gather updated descriptions of programs for the individual site reports, (2) update our information on the factors that have shaped each program, and (3) collect information needed for completing the IRI items. As with the IRI, the interview forms were pilot-tested last spring and revised for use this year. Many of the redundant items were eliminated and the interviews as a whole have been streamlined.

Types of Interview Forms

Figure 4 summarizes the interview forms that your team will be using. There are 10 different forms; six deal with specific component areas and three are designed for teachers, parents and the PDC council chairperson. The tenth interview, the Comparison Program Interview, will be administered to comparison school principals and comparison Head Start center directors. There is no specific interview for the training component of PDC since questions related to training are included in the other interviews. The method for dividing these interviews among team members is discussed in the on-site procedures section of this manual and will be reviewed during the training session.

The PDC coordinator will identify the people you will be interviewing. Only for the teacher interview have we sent a list of the teachers we would like to talk with (teachers were randomly selected by grade level).

Figure 4

PDC Winter 1977 Site Visit Interviews

Form	Audience	Estimated Administration Time
I. Teacher Interview	10 teachers; 2HS, 2KDG, 2G1, 2G2, 2G3 (randomly selected by H/S from teacher lists)	1 hour/teacher
II. Parent Interview	10 parents; 4HS, 6 elementary school (randomly selected active PDC parents by H/S and PDC staff)	20 min./parent
III. PDC Council Chairperson Interview	PDC Council Chairperson	20 minutes
IV. Education Component Interview	most knowledgeable person (about education component activities)	1-2 hours
V. Administration Component Interview	PDC Coordinator	1-2 hours
VI. Parent Involvement Component Interview	most knowledgeable person	1-2 hours
VII. Developmental Support Services Component Interview	most knowledgeable person	1-2 hours
VIII. Handicapped Component Interview	most knowledgeable person	1-2 hours
IX. Bilingual/Bicultural or Multicultural Component Interview	most knowledgeable person	1-2 hours
X. Bilingual/Bicultural Component Interview (BL/BC Demonstration Program)	most knowledgeable person	1-2 hours
XI. Comparison Program Interview	comparison school principals and comparison HS center directors.	1 hour

Instructions for Administering the Interview Forms

Preparation. Since this visit is viewed as an "update" on program progress you will have to study and be familiar with the site's background (this information is provided in one of your notebooks). In other words, prior to conducting a specific interview you should be well acquainted with the information that has already been collected from the site in the particular content area you will be discussing. As a result you might phrase the interview questions in terms of what has been collected previously and ask for an update. For example, rather than asking the education specialist to explain the PDC curriculum (which she has probably already done for us three or four times) you might say, "According to our records the PDC curriculum includes. . . . . Does that description still reflect the current PDC curriculum?" All background information relevant to specific interview form questions should be noted on the interview form for your use.

Introducing the interview. Before starting the interview introduce yourself, explain the purpose of the interview and the approximate amount of time it will take. In most cases the people interviewed will be familiar with High/Scope, DA, and the PDC evaluation. For those persons not familiar with the program or evaluation (such as parents and comparison school principals and Head Start center directors) you will need to offer more of an explanation of PDC and our evaluation. Be prepared to answer questions they may have about the evaluation and their involvement in it.

The paragraph on the cover sheet of each of the interview forms should not be read to the respondents. Rather, do as much explanation as required for the particular respondent.

Interviewing techniques. Try to make the interviews as much like conversation as you can. Thoroughly acquaint yourself with the interview form questions ahead of time, be familiar with what the site has done already, and don't read each question verbatim.

Listen to the respondent and follow up on his answers or comments; encourage him to expand on the question or issue he is discussing. Many of the items and response categories on the interview forms seem "cut and dried," but be sure that when you leave the interview you have a good understanding of that component's implementation, or a good feeling about how a teacher views the PDC curriculum or parent involvement in her classroom, or a clear understanding of what the comparison school curriculum looks like, etc.

Recording responses. There are basically four kinds of questions on the interview forms: a) open-ended questions (e.g., "What specific method do you use for pinpointing the developmental level of each child in each curriculum area?"); b) those that have easily distinguished response categories (e.g., Yes or No, None, Some or All, etc.); c) those that have more difficult response categories (e.g., no involvement, minor involvement, moderate involvement, major involvement or ineffective, moderately effective, very effective, etc.); d) questions that require numbers or names (e.g., number of children at the Head Start and elementary school level who have had various medical and dental assessments, names of persons responsible for each component and how much responsibility they have for implementing that component, etc.).

For each type of question let the respondent reply at as much length as necessary for you to get a good feel for how to score the answer on the IRI (for those questions falling in b and c types). This may involve you probing for more information, and you will have to use your own judgment in deciding where to place the interviewee's answer. In addition to placing a check beside the appropriate scoring category you will want to write down the respondent's comments. You also may want to reiterate the respondent's answer and how you scored it. For example, you may say, "Based on what you've just said, then, the involvement of teachers in the PDC curriculum can be described as 'moderate' rather than 'major'?"

> *Make certain that your notes are legible and complete. Several other people will have to read and understand what you have written. Take some time immediately following the interview to review your notes and add details or make your handwriting more clear.*

Codes for page 2 of interview forms. Don't worry about assigning these; we will do it when you return the forms to us. Be sure to complete all information requested on the first page, however.

Site record-keeping system. For some of the forms, particularly the parent involvement and support services interviews, we ask the respondent to provide numbers (e.g., number of children assessed, number of parents involved, etc.). Last summer a record-keeping system was suggested to the sites. The system consisted of a notebook containing forms for each component on which information of this sort could be recorded. The most knowledgeable person probably will need to refer to these records in answering some of the interview questions. In some cases, however, the respondent may hand you the notebook and ask you to make the calculations. Do so. A copy of the record-keeping system's forms has been included in your background information notebook.

Few specific questions about overall PDC training activities appear in the component interviews. In order to obtain this needed information we have asked the PDC coordinators to xerox their training activities records and have them available for you on Monday morning. Be sure to get them.

During the training session you will be required to familiarize yourself thoroughly with the interview forms you will be administering. If you have questions about any of the wording or the purpose of the question be sure to ask about them. Any problems with the interview forms should be cleared up before you go on site.

Comparison Program Interview Forms

These forms are less open-ended than the other interview forms so that we can minimize the burden we place on the interviewees. There are 24 questions on the form. Each question corresponds to one subcomponent of the IRI. The multiple-choice answers for each question were designed to provide ratings that correspond roughly to the IRI ratings obtained for PDC centers and schools. Thus, from these data we will be able to draw some conclusions about the degree to which the comparison programs resemble PDC programs.

You will be interviewing the principals and Head Start center directors at all of your site's comparison elementary schools and Head Start centers. The PDC coordinator has been sent copies of the form to distribute to each interviewee. We have told the coordinators that we want to speak with the single person in each school or center who is most knowledgeable about that program. Where sites do not have center directors, we have asked that the coordinator at those sites schedule interviews with some individual in each center (perhaps a teacher or resource specialist) who is most familiar with activities there.

When using these forms don't limit the interviewee to the multiple-choice responses. Encourage additional descriptive details and record this information in the "comments" section following each question.

IV

THE IMPLEMENTATION RATING INSTRUMENT

This manual contains instructions for completing the PDC Implementation Rating Instrument (IRI) and a brief statement on its development and use during previous site visits. The IRI consists of more than 350 detailed questions about each of the seven PDC component areas. The questions for each component are aggregated into subcomponents which correspond roughly to the required elements of the PDC Guidelines. (The administration component for example, is divided into four subcomponents: "operation of the PDC Council," "recruitment of PDC staff," "responsibility for coordination and implementation of the component areas" and "administrative training for PDC staff and council members.")

The data collected by your site team during the visit will be consolidated into answers for the IRI multiple-choice items after the various interviews have been completed. Based on our previous experience with the IRI, we feel you should allow at least two hours to complete each of the IRI's component area ratings.

IRI Construction

Both the interview forms and the IRI have been derived directly from the Implementation Year Guidelines for PDC by a process of (1) isolating discrete requirements in the guidelines, and (2) formulating a series of questions which will tell us:

- whether each program has done what the guidelines said they must,
- to what extent they have done it,
- how effective the participants feel the activities have been.

The multiple-choice IRI items relating to these questions are referred to as the IRI objective items. For each subcomponent, you will also rate its implementation along several dimensions on a subjective or judgmental level.

It is important to remember that the PDC Guidelines are, for the most part, general rather than specific. This allows each program to interpret the guidelines to meet their individual needs. Each PDC program will therefore be quite different from the others. The IRI has been designed to accommodate these differences.

The IRI and interview forms were field tested at five sites during the spring 1976 site visits. Based on feedback from High/Scope and DA staff and from the local PDC staff after this field test, the IRI has been revised slightly and the interview forms streamlined considerably.

How IRI Data Will Be Used

The IRI data will complement the individual program descriptions that will be prepared by DA staff. As mentioned, the interview forms have been designed to obtain the answers to the IRI items. The IRI, in turn, allows us to assign a rating to each site, according to the degree of its implementation of each guideline requirement. It should be stressed, however, that the Implementation Study is designed to describe and explain all factors affecting program implementation or the lack of it. The IRI ratings will be graphically displayed by component and/or subcomponent and ratings will be compared by component within and across sites. However, these ratings or profiles are virtually meaningless without the accompanying narrative which explains what the ratings mean.

Comparisons between the judgmental and objective ratings will be done and the relationship between the degree and features of implementation successes and the degree of measured impact on children, teachers and parents will be examined.

How and When To Complete the IRI

While any information you have about your site--regardless of its source--can be used when completing the IRI ratings, the major source of data will be the interviews to be conducted during this visit.

As soon as the interviews relating to a given component have been completed, you can begin rating implementation using the IRI. Because of the time involved in completing the IRI, you should complete certain component area interviews such that you can start the IRI ratings on Tuesday or Wednesday. To do this you may have to begin your ratings before all parent and teacher interviews have been completed. Complete the items for which you have information; skip those for which it is lacking. You can finish these as you get the information.

The procedure for doing those ratings should be something like the following: The person who conducted the interviews in a given component area has primary responsibility for completing that component's IRI (although the key High/Scope person has ultimate responsibility for seeing that all the IRI scales are completed). All ratings should be done jointly because each of the team members might have learned something in their interviews relevant to the other's rating. For example, the parent and teacher interviews contain questions about their role in the selection/development of the PDC educational approach and curriculum, as does the interview form for the most knowledgeable person in education. You should meet in your motel room (or other convenient place), read together each item from the IRI (only one IRI is provided per site, so one person will have to read the items) and decide on the appropriate rating. There is a code beside each IRI item indicating which interview form(s) and question(s) contain(s) the information needed to complete the IRI item. If there are disagreements among the team members on any of the items the lowest rating should be recorded and an explanation of the disagreement should be noted.

As mentioned earlier, at the end of each subcomponent you will find a second set of scales which ask you to rate that site's implementation of the subcomponent along several dimensions, using whatever information you have. These judgmental ratings allow you to go beyond the narrow criteria in the individual items and rely more heavily upon your "gut" feelings about the site's implementation. When all ratings are completed the judgmental and objective ratings will be compared.

One final point. We have provided considerable space next to each item in the IRI. Use it to note problems with the rating, mitigating circumstances, and anything you feel is needed to make that rating meaningful. More important than rating programs is understanding them.

How to Score IRI Objective Items

Each of the objective items in the IRI has six rating categories. Categories "a", "b", "c" and "d" are program rating categories constituting a four-point scale representing low to high levels of implementation. Category "e" indicates the lack of sufficient information to rate an item and category "f" indicates that an item was not applicable at that site. Thus there are several decisions which must be made before an IRI item can be rated.

Decision #1: Is the question applicable at this site? In certain instances, an IRI question will not be applicable at a given site. There are a number of reasons why this might take place; OCD might have exempted a site from a required activity, or the required element from the PDC guidelines on which an IRI item is based may be totally inappropriate for the development of a program at a particular site. For example, one of the multicultural items concerns the distribution of PDC notices, newsletters and other written materials in languages other than English. If none of the PDC children are dominant in languages other than English this item is not appropriate. In these instances, the "Question not applicable" category is scored. However, category "f" should always be used sparingly. Since the objective for the Implementation Study is to find out not only what people have done, but also why, it is better to enter an "a" rating (which will be reflected in the implementation profile for that site) and then explain the local factors accounting for the absence of that program element. This will not always be an easy judgment to make; if a coordinator tells you that they didn't do something "because they did not feel it was appropriate for their site", should you code that an "a" with the coordinator's explanation as the factor accounting for that implementation, or should you code an "f"? If in doubt, code an "a" and make a note; we can always change it later.

Decision #2: Is sufficient information on program implementation available? We have designed the site interviews to correspond to the IRI items. Hence, these interviews should provide most of the information needed to complete the IRI. In addition, feel free to use information from other sources (i.e., previous site visits, site documentation, comments by staff, personal observation, etc.). The following general rules apply to the review of information on site activities. Please keep them in mind when completing the IRI.

- Information should be screened based on what has taken place, not what will take place in the future. (However, be sure to make a note of future plans in the margin next to the item in question.)

- Scrutiny of the evidence should be strict. It is better to rate a project lower in implementation than to always give them the benefit of the doubt.

- Be skeptical and ask yourself if there is any corroborating information.

- In every case, be sure the evidence supports your rating.

If enough information on program implementation is available to accurately rate an item, then complete the rating in categories "a", "b", "c" or "d". If an insufficient amount of information is available to rate an item, score category "e": "Data insufficient for rating." BE SURE TO SCORE EACH ITEM.

NOTE: If only a little more information is needed make a note of it and ask the coordinator or appropriate staff person for it before you leave the site. Then go back and complete the rating in question.

Types of Objective IRI Items

Several types of items are included in the IRI to assess program implementation in each of the seven component areas. The following four item types make up more than 80% of the items on the IRI:

Type A: Items determining the presence of a coordinated activity or program at both the Head Start and elementary levels. The largest single group of items on the IRI are of this type. The following is an example of an item of this nature:

A PDC diagnostic and evaluative system to identify the educational needs of individual children:

_____ a) Has not been developed or selected.

_____ b) Has been developed or selected but is not implemented.

_____ c) Is implemented in classes at the Head Start level or elementary levels.

_____ d) Is implemented in classes at both the Head Start level and the elementary level.

_____ e) Data insufficient for rating.

_____ f) Question not applicable.

These items are simple to interpret and ask the rater to decide if a program element has been implemented at the Head Start level and/or at the elementary level. A score in category "a" indicates that the program element has not been selected or developed. A score is entered in category "b" if the program element has been selected or developed, but is not implemented at either level. Category "c" is scored if the program element has been selected or developed and is implemented at one level or the other, and category "d" is scored if the program is implemented at both levels.

Before completing the items of this type, make sure you don't assume the program must be present at the Head Start level because the Head Start model parallels the PDC guidelines. At the elementary level, make sure that the specific PDC activity is taking place on a regular basis even if in only a few classes or grade levels. Implementation is judged by ongoing planned activities, not an isolated event.

Type B: Items determining the percentage of a group participating in program activities. Where Type A items determine the presence of a given element, these items measure the extent of that implementation. The following is an example of items of this nature.

According to the information available, roughly what percentage of the elementary school teachers have been directly involved in the ongoing discussion and refinement of the PDC educational approach and curriculum?

_____ a) None or few (0-20%) or a PDC curriculum has not been developed or selected.

_____ b) Some (21-50%).

_____ c) Most (51-80%).

_____ d) Almost all or all (81-100%).

_____ e) Data insufficient for rating.

_____ f) Question not applicable.

As you can see, if there were few or no elementary teachers involved, or if there is no identifiable curriculum category "a" is rated. If participation of the identified group is between 20% and 50% then category "b" is marked; category "c" is rated if the level of participation is between 50% and 80%; and category "d" is selected if participation is more than 80%.

Type C: Items assessing the level of perceived effectiveness of the PDC program. Comments by local staff and parents are a good way to get an indication of the effectiveness of program implementation. An item based on teacher assessments is illustrated below.

> According to elementary teachers interviewed, has training in the PDC diagnostic and evaluative system been useful to elementary teachers in implementing the PDC diagnostic and evaluative system in their classrooms?
>
> _____ a) Training has not taken place or less than 20% attended.
>
> _____ b) Training has not been useful.
>
> _____ c) Training has been moderately useful.
>
> _____ d) Training has been very useful.
>
> _____ e) Data insufficient for rating.
>
> _____ f) Question not applicable.

The Teacher Interview form is worded in such a way that the respondent's answer will be categorized, at that time, as "not useful", "moderately useful", or "very useful".

Type D: Items assessing the role members of a group played in program activities. A number of the questions in the education, parent involvement and administration components ask the rater to make distinctions between no involvement and playing a minor, moderate or major role in program development activities. These items relate mainly to the degree of involvement rather than to the number of group members involved. Following is an example of an item of this type:

Head Start teachers

_____ a) Have not been involved in the ongoing discussion and refinement of the PDC educational approach.

_____ b) Played a minor role in the ongoing discussion and refinement of the PDC educational approach.

_____ c) Played a moderate role in the ongoing discussion and refinement of the PDC educational approach.

_____ d) Played a major role in the ongoing discussion and refinement of the PDC educational approach.

_____ e) Data insufficient for rating.

_____ f) Question not applicable.

Definitions of key terms used in the IRI (such as "minor", moderate", and "major") can be found at the back of this manual.

NOTE: At the beginning of each IRI subcomponent we have excerpted the portions of the PDC Guidelines from which the items in that subcomponent were derived. Read these excerpts carefully; they will help you to better understand the intent of the rating scales.

How to Score the IRI Judgmental Scales

The items on the IRI are grouped by component. Within each component, the items are aggregated into subcomponents that have relatively homogeneous item content. In addition to rating each of the multiple-choice items on the IRI, every site team will also complete a set of more subjective ratings at the end of each subcomponent.

The purpose of the judgmental ratings of PDC implementation is to capture the impressions of on-the-spot observers. These judgments may be more difficult to substantiate than judgments based on explicit criteria. However, in arriving at these impressionistic assessments, you can intuitively weight the importance of your various perceptions and can take factors into account that are inaccessible by more objective processes. The result often provides a meaningful complement to information processed according to more strictly governed operations.

The terms in which ratings are to be made have been defined generally to suit a variety of circumstances, but if you find that the definitions for a set of terms do not fit some particular circumstance, redefine the terms in whatever way is relevant and make note of the altered definition. For example, "intensity of implementation" has been defined as a function of human attention or energy; if you find a particular situation in which it is more relevant to speak of intensity in terms of material resources allocated to implementation, use the same scale terms ("None" to "high") but redefine them in whatever way you consider appropriate.

Again, the rating should be a group decision with the component person indicating first how she/he thinks it should be rated and then getting input from the other team members. If the judgmental rating differs greatly from the IRI objective ratings you should attempt to explain the differances at the bottom of the sheet.

Judgmental IRI items. There are four scales to be completed on the judgmental sheet, each of which has six rating categories. Categories 2, 3 and 4 are program rating categories constituting a 3-point scale of implementation (low, medium and high). The other three categories ("none," "not applicable," and "uncodable") are used when appropriate. The first three scales are descriptive (breadth of implementation, intensity of implementation, and effectiveness of elements in terms or organizational acceptance) while the fourth scale is a rating of the overall level of subcomponent implementation.

Definitions of the four rating scales and categories within are given below.

Breadth of Implementation: among those who could or should be involved in implementation of these elements, what is the extent of actual involvement?

1. None: in general, no one is involved to any meaningful degree.

2. Narrow: in general, the number involved is smaller than one would expect, given the local circumstances and guideline requirements.

3. Moderate: in general, the number involved is about what one would expect, given the local circumstances and guideline requirements.

4. Broad: in general, the number involved is greater than one would expect, given the local circumstances and guideline requirements.

5. Not applicable: implementation of these elements is not required.

6. Uncodable: cannot be coded in any of the above ways (explain).

Intensity of Implementation: among those responsible for implementing this subcomponent, what is the level of attention, energy, or importance given to its implementation?

1. None: in general, no meaningful degree of attention, energy, or importance has been given.

2. Low: in general, the degree of attention, energy, or importance given is low relative to other aspects of the school program.

3. Moderate: in general, the degree of attention, energy, or importance given is about the same as that given to other aspects of the school program.

4. High: in general, the degree of attention, energy or importance given is high relative to other aspects of the school program.

5. Not applicable: implementation of these elements not required.

6. Uncodable: cannot be coded (explain).

Effectiveness of Elements in Terms of Organizational Acceptance: among those affected by the implementation of this subcomponent (i.e., parents, teachers, council members, etc. but not PDC staff), what level of satisfaction or approval has been shown?

1. None: no one has been affected by the subcomponent since it hasn't been implemented.

2. Low: in general, those affected by the implementation of this subcomponent are cynical, doubtful, or tentative in their acceptance of these elements.

3. Moderate: in general, those affected by the implementation of this subcomponent are willing to accept these elements on a wait-and-see basis.

4. High: in general, those affected by the implementation are positive and approving in their acceptance of these elements.

5. Not applicable: in general, implementation of these elements is not required.

6. Uncodable: cannot be coded (explain)

Overall Level of Implementation: Based on the above ratings and any other information you have, what is your general assessment of the overall implementation of these elements?

1. None: in general, implementation is non-existent.

2. Low: in general, implementation is lower than one would expect, given the local circumstances and guideline requirements.

3. Moderate: in general, implementation is just about what one would expect, given the local circumstances and guideline requirements.

4. High: in general, implementation is higher than one would expect, given the local circumstances and guideline requirements.

5. Not applicable: in general, implementation of these elements is not required (explain).

6. Uncodable: cannot be coded (explain).

The format for these subjective ratings is illustrated in Figure 5 on the following page. Before completing the ratings, review the anchor points for each of the scales. Then, record your "gut level" impression of program implementation.

Figure 5

Sample Judgmental Rating Scales

SUBCOMPONENT: Search for Additional Funding Sources

Before continuing with your ratings of the multiple-choice questions, we would like to get your impressions of the level of implementation of this subcomponent using an alternate technique. Based on everything you know about this site, how would you rate the level of implementation of this subcomponent with respect to the following dimensions: (Please explain any "not applicable" or "uncodable" ratings)

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR ANSWERS CLEARLY

1. Breadth of Implementation: Among those who could or should be involved in the implementation of this subcomponent, what is the extent of actual involvement?

   none narrow moderate broad not applicable uncodable

2. Intensity of Implementation: Among those responsible for implementing this subcomponent, what is the level of attention, energy, or importance given to its implementation?

   none low moderate high not applicable uncodable

3. Effectiveness of Elements in Terms of Organizational Acceptance: Among those affected by implementation of this subcomponent (i.e., parents, teachers, council members, etc., but not PDC staff) what level of satisfaction or approval has been shown?

   none low moderate high not applicable uncodable

4. Overall Level of Implementation: Based on the above ratings and any other information you have, what is your general assessment of the overall implementation level of this factor?

   none low moderate high not applicable uncodable

If your codings on these scales conflict with the ratings given on the preceding IRI questions, please attempt to explain that conflict below:

Definitions for Key IRI terms

The pilot-test last spring identified a number of terms on the IRI that needed further clarification. These terms and their respective definitions are listed below where possible. Please familiarize yourself with them so that our understanding of key terms is standard.

1. ACADEMIC YEAR

   The time period beginning July 1, 1976 when PDC staff begin activities for a new school year and ending June 30, 1977.

2. AIDES AND ASSOCIATES

   Paid personnel working in the classroom under the supervision of a teacher.

3. ASSESSMENT OF THE NUTRITIONAL NEEDS OF CHILDREN

   "can be identified on the basis of their health records (height, weight, and hemoglobin or hematocrit) and information supplied by parents."*

4. DIAGNOSTIC AND EVALUATIVE SYSTEM

   A system that "should facilitate individualized instruction by enabling the teacher to pinpoint the developmental level of each child in the various curriculum areas."*

5. HEAD START CENTER COMMITTEE

   The committee, operating by OCD requirements, that is made up of all parents of Head Start children at the Head Start center level.

6. INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH

   An approach that facilitates "individualized instruction by enabling the teacher to pinpoint the developmental level of each child in the various curriculum areas. The teacher should then develop an instructional program for each child based upon the child's diagnosed strengths and weaknesses.

---

*Definitions taken directly from the PDC Guidelines.

7. INTERNAL ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

A formal or informal system, whereby staff, parents, and Council members continually examine their own and the project's progress in providing continuity in the educational and developmental elements. It might include refresher sessions in the philosophy and goals of PDC and in the principles of child growth and development and their relation to the intellectual and affective development of children. Such sessions should ensure the educational approach and curriculum and their own teaching in the light of these goals and principles. Exchange visits between Head Start and school teachers and parents might also be included so that they can assess the commonality and continuity of approach."*

8. JOINT CONFERENCES, MEETINGS AND/OR WORKSHOPS

"Joint" means between Head Start and elementary teaching staff. The purpose of these meetings is to maintain communication according to the program guidelines.

9. MEMBER OF GROUP

A person officially serving on a group and appearing on the roster of that group. Excludes persons who occasionally attend at their own "whim," but includes persons who are rotating members of a group and attend every third or fourth meeting.

10. MINOR, MODERATE, AND MAJOR ROLES

a. Minor role:

Indicates that a person or group had minimal involvement and participation in an activity. Participation in decision-making was irregular or almost nonexistent. The end result of the activity reflects little or almost none of the input from the person or group.

b. Moderate role:

Indicates that a person or group had some involvement and participation in an activity. Participation in decision-making was regular but not exceptional. The end result of the activity reflects only some of the input of the person or group.

---

*Definitions taken directly from the PDC Guidelines.

c. Major role:

Indicates that a person or group had concentrated involvement and participation in an activity. Participation in decision-making was frequent. The end result of the activity reflects the input of the person or group.

11. PARENTS

The natural, or adopted parents of a PDC child or the legal guardians of a child, or the adults in a household responsible for the child. When computing percentages, assume one parent per child.

12. PROVISION FOR REGULAR COMMUNICATION

In this context, communication means both meetings and written documents.

13. SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

In this context, funding other than that provided directly for PDC activities by OCD.

14. TIMETABLE

A schedule of the time activities or events are to occur.

15. TRAINING

Deliberate instruction in order to make a person more proficient in an area related to the PDC program. A training activity is distinguished from a meeting in that the principal purpose of the gathering is the increase of knowledge or skill proficiency and not just the imparting of routine program information.

16. WORKSHOPS, CLASSES AND OTHER ACTIVITIES FOR PARENTS

Any activity that has as an overt purpose the attendance of parents and is related to the PDC work programs.

V

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The post-visit writing requirements for DA and High/Scope staff are outlined below. Briefly, DA staff will be writing site implementation reports which contain descriptions of the PDC programs in individual sites. High/Scope staff will be writing brief descriptions of the IRI ratings for each subcomponent which will accompany and explain the IRI graphs. Also, they will be updating the "factors affecting implementation" sheets, identifying "lessons learned" from PDC, and defending or rejecting hypotheses regarding PDC implementation. *Therefore, High/Scope team members should bring the IRI, the Comparison Program Interviews, and the hypotheses review section of each interview back to Michigan. The DA staff should keep the individual component interviews and the parent, teacher, and council chairperson interviews.*

Writing Responsibilities for High/Scope Staff

There are five post-visit responsibilities for High/Scope team members:

- write brief supporting statements for each component's IRI rating;
- update the summary of factors affecting implementation produced last spring for each site;
- review the hypotheses from last summary report and identify those supported by your site's experience;
- summarize PDC staff's statements about "lessons learned" for PDC;
- compile the Comparison Program Interview results.

IRI supporting statements. As mentioned earlier, the IRI ratings will be graphically displayed by subcomponent and component level in the report. For the Implementation report to OCD we want to include the graphs and a written description that explains each. Therefore, for each of the IRI subcomponents you need to provide four bits of information: 1) a brief description of the form of each component's implementation; 2) a brief description of the extent of that implementation; 3) a sentence or two about participants' perceptions of the effectiveness of that implementation; and 4) a few sentences about why the subcomponent is being implemented the way it is.

The items within each subcomponent of the IRI pertain to the first three areas (description of program implementation, extent of implementation, and perceived effectiveness) and will be your source of information. The why information should have been gathered during the component interviews. So, in writing your summaries for each subcomponent you will need to cover the four areas, writing a few sentences under each. They should be brief and to the point. Refer to the example in Figure 6.

If both High/Scope team members are involved in the PDC program interviews and the IRI ratings they should work together on these summaries. If only one of the High/Scope team members carried out these activities she/he will write this section. When writing these statements keep in mind that DA is producing extensive descriptions of the implementation of each component at the site level and that we need something brief to describe the subcomponent ratings that will be generated. No forms are provided for this; simply type your summaries on a blank sheet of paper.

Summaries of factors affecting implementation. After the spring visits last year, team members generated a list of factors which they felt shaped the implementation of PDC at each site. A list of these local factors is included in your site background notebook and we need an update on it. So, after the site visit read through this list carefully and on a separate page indicate 1) whether or not you think each factor still applies to the site (if you disagree with any, explain why) and 2) whether there are other factors which you feel affect program implementation. If so, add them to the list along with an explanation of how they affect the level of implementation. A sample list of factors for one site has been included in Figure 7.

Figure 6

Sample Summary for an IRI Subcomponent

EDUCATION COMPONENT

Subcomponent III:	Development and implementation of a compatible and coordinated PDC curriculum.
Description of Implementation:	The site selected the Walker Street PDC Curriculum, which emphasizes the individualized instruction in reading and writing. Project staff have developed a social studies component that focuses on exposing children to a variety of cultures.
Extent of Implementation:	The curriculum has been implemented in 100% of the Head Start classes but only in 25% of the elementary school classrooms (kindergarten only). Almost all of the Head Start teachers use the curriculum on a daily basis to plan classroom activities while only some of the elementary teachers do so.
Participants' Perceptions of Implementation:	Almost all of the Head Start teachers think that the curriculum is a good basis for developing classroom activities but only a few of the elementary school teachers feel this way (mainly those in kindergarten and some in the first grade).
Reasons for Implementation:	The PDC staff felt that, rather than try to implement a continuous curriculum in five grade levels at the same time they would concentrate on two levels (Head Start and kindergarten) this year and then add a grade level in each of the following years. The focus of the curriculum and planning, then, has been on the two grade levels mentioned above in which the curriculum is implemented and coordinated and with which teachers are happy.

Figure 7

Factors Affecting Program Implementation: Texas

1. The local school district contains a small centralized administration with one person exercising considerable authority over all aspects of all the school programs. This, combined with the fact that this one person has strongly supported PDC, has meant that the program has been able to get the facilities, teachers, and materials it needs.

2. The program was carefully designed administratively, with considerable attention paid to the channels of authority and communication. The director of instruction (above) is something of a student of administration, who looks to the ultimate implementation of the PDC concept district-wide. He has carefully designed the role of the ECS principal, and selected the individual with an eye to the day when the principal will assume the duties of the PDC coordinator.

3. The teachers participating in PDC were handpicked by the director of instruction and PDC staff and given the option of whether or not they would participate. This voluntary participation insured that the teachers were compatible with the PDC objectives, established a feeling among the teachers that they were a select group, and insured that the program would be staffed by teachers willing to put additional time and energy into the program. The voluntary participation also allowed the designers to introduce changes that were radically different from what had existed previously.

4. The lack of a strong teachers' union. This factor, along with the strong centralized administration in the district, made some of these other factors possible. Demands could be made on teachers' time and energy beyond the normal; teachers could be recruited and moved easily.

5. Head Start and elementary programs have always been located and administered jointly in Texas. The preschool program (which includes Head Start) is and has been for several years a part of the regular district program. Teachers in the preschool program have the same certification as the elementary teachers, and are drawn from the same population. Preschool centers have always been located right in elementary schools, under the direction of the school principal. The transition to PDC in this area was therefore relatively minor.

6. The attitude among the parents that the school is staffed by experts who know what is best educationally for their children. There exists in the community (I am told that this is typical of the Mexican-American community) a view toward educators not unlike that found toward physicians in other parts of the country. This has not inhibited the extent of parent involvement, but has limited the involvement in substantive roles in the school and classroom.

Review of hypotheses. As a part of the component interviews you will be reviewing some hypotheses with the interviewees. You will also be discussing some in the Friday meeting with the PDC staff. You have been provided with a list of these hypotheses. In the space below each, give any evidence you may have of support or lack of support for each of the hypotheses based on both your knowledge of the site and the comments of the PDC staff. Also, if on the basis of your observations, you can formulate additional hypotheses add them to the list along with supporting evidence for them.

"Lessons learned." In your Friday meetings you will be focusing on staff perceptions of the lessons they have learned from their experience with PDC--what they would do differently next time. Obviously, these will be closely related to the factors affecting program implementation, but hopefully they will be phrased as positive statements of alternative decisions or actions. Briefly summarize these on a separate sheet of paper.

Comparison program interview results. Little needs to be done with these interviews. Most of the questions on the form are in a multiple-choice format with space provided for additional comments, such as a description of the curriculum in a comparison school. Make sure your notes on these comments are clear, complete, and legible.

Unless both High/Scope team members are involved in interviewing component staff and in completing the IRI, one person will most likely be responsible for tasks 1-4 while the second person will be responsible for the fifth task.

Reporting schedule. Please give your written reports to Allen within one week of your return from the field. If you are going on two site visits try to leave your first report with him before you leave on your second visit. The description of the subcomponents could be done on-site after you complete the IRI ratings; the factors, hypotheses, and summary sheets could be easily done in two or three days after the visit. There should be no problem, then, in completing the writing requirements within one week of the visit. Also, please return the IRI ratings and Comparison Program interviews to Allen when you complete your writing requirements.

Writing Responsibilities for DA Staff

Following the site visits, reports describing the individual PDC programs will be prepared. An outline for these reports follows. The first two sections of the outline (I. Introduction and II. Methodology) will be standard and will be attached to the front end of the report after the other sections are completed. Therefore, the writers are responsible for preparing only Sections III, IV, and V. Five person-days will be allocated for preparing each report. The reporting assignments will be made during training so that each staff member will be aware of his/her writing assignments before going into the field.

During the data collection process, the DA staff member who is assigned to prepare the report should conduct or sit in on, as many of the component interviews as is possible and, for those component interviews that are conducted by other team members, the assigned writer should review the data with the interviewer and make sure that he/she attends all team meetings at which the PDC program is discussed for purposes of completing the IRI. Before the data collection team leaves the site on Friday afternoon, the DA staff member who is assigned to prepare the site report should make sure that he/she has a complete understanding of the PDC program and has copies of all the component interviews.

OUTLINE FOR PDC SITE REPORTS[1]

January/February 1977

I. Introduction (standardized section)

A. Background on PDC

B. Background on PDC Evaluation

C. Purpose of this Report (describe how this report fits in with the overall project evaluation)

II. Methodology (standardized section)

A. Study Design

B. Instrumentation

C. Data Collection Procedures

III. Site Characteristics

This information is not obtained by the interview forms nor the Record-Keeping System, but will be gathered at the time of the site visit.

1. Number of classrooms and students per grade level.

2. Number of teachers (full-time and part-time) and aides (full-time and part-time) per grade level.

3. Ethnic background of students per grade level (i.e., American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic, Black, White, Other).

4. Language dominance of students per grade level.

IV. Component Description

Explain that the project is divided into several components and list them. Emphasize that this is a description of each component.

---

[1]Prepared by Beth Arnow and Howard Fleischman, Development Associates Inc.

A. Administration

1. Program Organization: Describe the various relationships within the PDC program (provide an organizational chart if possible).

Administration 1c
- Relationship of the PDC Council to the grantee;

Administration 7
- Relationships between the PDC Council and the Head Start Center Committees; and the PDC Council and the PTA(s).

Administration 13
- Relationships between the PDC Council and the Head Start staff(s); and the PDC Council and the elementary school staff(s).

Administration 2,12
Chairperson 1
- Describe the responsibilities of the PDC Council. Include whether they are involved in the recruitment and selection of PDC staff.

Administration 3
- Describe the composition of the PDC Council.

Chairperson 2
Parent 1b,c
- Describe the level and nature of involvement of each group on the Council.

Administration 4,12
- Describe the role of the PDC staff on the PDC Council.

Parent 1
- Describe the role of parents in decision-making.

2. Program Communication

Administration 5
- Describe the kinds of information that have been provided to the Council, and the frequency that they are provided.

Administration 6a,b
- Describe the program communication patterns between the PDC Council and the Head Start Staff(s); and the PDC Council and the elementary school staff(s).

Administration 6c,d
- Describe the program communication patterns between the PDC Council and the Head Start parents; the PDC Council and the elementary school parents. Include the kinds of information that have been provided.

Administration 7

- Describe the relationships between the PDC Council and the Head Start Center Committee(s); the PDC Council and the elementary school PTA(s).

Administration 8

- Describe the role of the PDC Council in monitoring communication and coordination between the Head Start Center(s) and the elementary school(s).

3. Training

Record-Keeping System Training Sessions/ Chairperson 4a

- Describe how the training that has been held this year for PDC Council members has addressed:
  - philosophy, goals, basic principles, and required elements of the PDC program;
  - local goals and objectives;
  - organization, philosophy, and goals of Head Start;
  - organization, philosophy, and goals of the elementary school.

Record-Keeping System Chairperson 4c

- Describe the training given in the areas of roles, responsibilities, and goals of the PDC Council, Head Start Policy Council, and the Board of Education.

Record-Keeping System Chairperson 4b

- Describe the training given in decision-making.

4. Funding

Administration 14

- Describe the efforts to seek other funding sources.

B. Education

1. Staff and Coordination

Administration 11

- Describe who is responsible for implementing and coordinating the program.

Education 4/Teacher 9

- Describe the teacher meetings to coordinate activities.

Education 5/Teacher 10,11

- Describe the written communication for coordinating activities (within PDC; Head Start with the elementary school(s)).

2. Educational (Instructional) Approach and Curriculum

Education 6/Teacher 2

- Describe the philosophies regarding learning styles and approaches to teaching.

Education 8

- Describe the general goals and approaches of the PDC curriculum:

  - how do they address each area;

Education 9

  - how are basic skills emphasized at each level;

Education 10

  - how is physical growth emphasized; and

Education 11

  - how is social-emotional growth emphasized.

Education 12

- Describe the areas of curriculum that utilize individualized instruction.

Education 7
Teacher 3,4

- Describe the extent of use of the PDC curriculum:

  - how many classrooms use it;

  - how much do they use it;

  - what areas are and are not used;

  - in what grade levels is it operational; and

  - what percentage of teachers use it.

Education 14

- Describe the use of specialized resource persons to develop instructional programs for children.

Education 1

- Describe the refinement of the PDC curriculum:

  - what is the process;

Teacher 1/Education 3

  - who is involved and what is the nature of their involvement;

Parent 3

  - have parents been involved in the process;

Education 2

  - what refinement has resulted.

4. Diagnostic and Evaluative System

Education 13

- Describe the diagnostic and evaluation system.

Teacher 6

- Describe the process for pinpointing the developmental levels of children.

Teacher 7

- Describe how this information is used to match children to educational programs.

Education 13d,e

- Describe how many children have been diagnosed and how many have been matched to educational programs.

C. Training

Administration 11

1. Staffing and Training Coordination: Describe who is responsible for planning and implementing staff training. Include:

   - the title of the person(s);
   - if training includes PDC staff or other individuals;
   - if training is coordinated by a training committee;
   - how existing Head Start and elementary school training has been coordinated with PDC training.

See Record-Keeping System

2. Preservice Training

   - Schedule of training: Describe what took place. Include some information about the number of hours of training.
   - Describe the preservice training in terms of the following:
     - persons responsible for organizing and conducting the training;
     - the content of the training. Use all categories listed in the Record-Keeping System, but you do not have to limit descriptions to this information;
     - number of persons by position attending the training sessions.

3. Inservice Training

- Schedule of training: Describe what has taken place. Include some information about the number of hours of training.

- Describe the preservice training in terms of the following:

  - persons responsible for organizing and conducting the training;

  - the content of the training. Use all the categories listed in the Information System, but you do not have to limit descriptions to this information.

D. Developmental Support Services

1. Staffing

Administration 11
Development Support Services 1,8

- Describe the personnel (PDC and other) responsible for these services and their responsibilities. Indicate how much of their time is devoted to this component.

2. Services to Children

D.S.S. 2

- Describe how the survey of community resources was done.

D.S.S. 4

- Describe the system for assessment and delivery of developmental support services to children.

D.S.S. 8
Record-Keeping System

- Describe the process for medical and dental assessments. Indicate how many children have been screened this academic year.

- Describe the assessment process for other areas. Include how it's done, who does it, and the percent of children receiving it:

D.S.S. 7

  - nutrition;

D.S.S. 9

  - mental health; and

D.S.S. 10

  - social services.

D.S.S. 12

- Describe the provision for followup services once the assessments are made.

Record-Keeping System

- Indicate how many children needed followup and how many received it.

D.S.S. 13

- Describe the procedures used to familiarize children with the health services they receive prior to delivery of services.

3. Provisions for Parental Involvement in the Health Care of Their Children

D.S.S. 14
Parent 6-8

- Describe how parents have been encouraged to become involved in the health care process relating to their children. Indicate the specific information about their children that they have been provided with.

- Describe the kinds of general information that parents have been provided with:

D.S.S. 15

  - health resources;

Parent 9,10

  - preventive health.

4. Health and Nutrition Education

D.S.S. 19

- Describe how meals and snacks are used as opportunities for learning.

D.S.S. 20

- Describe how the nutritional experiences offered to PDC children reinforce the good aspects of food served at home.

5. Training

D.S.S. 16

- Describe the training given to the teaching staff(s) on integrating health education into ongoing classroom activities.

D.S.S. 17

- Describe how parents and teachers have been provided with the opportunity to learn the principles of preventive health, emergency first aid, and safety practices.

D.S.S. 18

- Describe the training for teachers and parents on the relationship of the child's growth, development, and learning potential.

6. Record-Keeping

D.S.S. 5

- Describe the Record-Keeping System, in the areas of: medical, dental, and social services. Explain how it operates and whether or not parents are informed.

D.S.S. 11

- Describe how medical, dental, and developmental records are completed. Include who is responsible at each level.

D.S.S. 6

- What percentage of the social service records were forwarded to the elementary school.

E. Parent Involvement

1. Staffing and Coordination

Administration 11

- Describe the persons on the PDC staff who are involved in the Parent Involvement component and describe their responsibilities.

Parent Involvement 1,2

- Describe the Parent Involvement program(s) at the Head Start and at the elementary school(s). Describe how they are coordinated.

Parent Involvement 4

- Describe the nature and extent of coordination between the Head Start Center Committee(s) and the PTA(s).

2. Parents in Decision-Making Roles

Parent Involvement 5

- Describe the involvement of parents on the PDC Council. Include information on attendance at meetings and how many PDC Council representatives are bilingual or multicultural.

Parent Involvement 6
Parent 1

- Describe the role of PDC Council parents in decision-making. Explain their level of involvement and give examples of their involvement.

Parent Involvement 7b

- Outline the project's strategies for involving parents in component activities.

Parent Involvement 7a

- Describe the involvement of parents in decision-making in each component. Indicate how many have been involved.

3. Parent Participation in the Classroom

Parent Involvement 9b
Parent Involvement 9a
Teacher 13
Parent Involvement 8

- Describe the roles of parents in the classroom. Include how many parent volunteers participate in the classroom and how many paid classroom aides are parents.

4. Parent Education

Parent Involvement 3

- Describe the PDC parent activities that have been held. Describe how parents were involved in planning and indicate the level of parent involvement (percentage who attended at least one event, number who attended almost all events).

Parent Involvement 10

- Describe the training that parents received in classroom-related activities. Include how many attended and the role of teachers in training.

F. Services for Handicapped Children

1. Staffing and Coordination

Handicapped 1

- Describe the staff that served the handicapped and learning disabled children.

Handicapped 2

- Describe how the program services for handicapped and learning disabled children are coordinated.

2. Assessment

Handicapped 3

- Describe how handicapped and learning disabled children are identified. Describe how the kinds of services required were determined.

Handicapped 10

- Describe the provisions for early diagnosis of learning disabilities, especially in the area of reading.

Handicapped 4

- Indicate how many handicapped and learning disabled children have been identified.

3. Services Provided to Children

Handicapped 5b
- Describe the extent to which handicapped and learning disabled children are mainstreamed.

Handicapped 5c
- Describe the types of services they receive, the frequency duration, and who provides the services.

Handicapped 6
- Describe how children who are not mainstreamed are served.

Handicapped 7
- Describe whether or not input from previous teachers of handicapped and learning disabled children has been used in planning an effective curriculum geared to children's abilities.

4. Parent Involvement

Handicapped 13
- Describe how parents of handicapped and learning disabled children have input into planning.

Handicapped 14
- Describe parent participation in the classroom.

5. Training

Handicapped 11
- Describe the training given to PDC staff and classroom teachers on special individualized help for handicapped and learning disabled children.

Handicapped 12
- Describe the participation of local agencies in the training.

Handicapped 15
- Describe the special training provided to parents of handicapped and learning disabled children to help them identify their needs and steer them to community resources.

6. Accommodations

Handicapped 8
- Describe the special materials used with handicapped and learning disabled children.

Handicapped 9

- Describe any structural changes and classroom reorganizations that have been made to accommodate handicapped children within the regular classroom setting.

G. Services for Bilingual/Bicultural or Multicultural Children*

1. Services Provided to Children

Multicultural 1
Teacher 18a

- Describe the coordination of special services to meet the needs of bilingual/bicultural or multicultural children.

Multicultural 5

- Describe the extent of participation of bilingual/bicultural or multicultural resource persons in the classroom.

Multicultural 6

- Describe how often children work with bilingual/bicultural or multicultural resource persons in the classroom.

Multicultural 7
Teacher 18d

- Describe the extent of use of bilingual/bicultural or multicultural materials and activities in the classroom.

Multicultural 8

- Describe how often children work with bilingual/bicultural activities and materials.

2. Training

Multicultural 2

- Describe the training activities to make staff sensitive to the needs of bilingual/bicultural or multicultural children.

Multicultural 3

- Describe the training activities to help staff identify bilingual/bicultural or multicultural resource persons and materials.

Multicultural 4

- Describe the extent of staff training at the sessions.

---

*To be discussed for: Norwalk, Connecticut; Pahokee, Florida; Toccoa, Georgia; Des Moines, Iowa; Takoma Park, Maryland; Pontiac, Michigan; Tacoma, Washington; Morgantown, West Virginia; and Salt Lake City, Utah.

3. Parent Involvement

Parent 12
- Has the importance of bilingual/bicultural education been explained to parents?

Multicultural 10
- Describe the outreach efforts to parents.

Multicultural 11
- Are PDC notices, newsletters, etc., translated into other languages?

Multicultural 12
- Are interpreters available?

Multicultural 9
Parent 12
- Describe the extent of bilingual/bicultural and/or multicultural parents' input concerning their children's education, especially regarding the language and cultural elements. Describe the techniques used to get this input.

Multicultural 13
- Describe the multicultural activities conducted for parents.

Multicultural 14
Parent 3
- Describe the extent of parents' attendance at the multicultural activities.

Multicultural 15,17
- Describe the extent of parent participation in the classroom.

Multicultural 16
- Describe the percentages of teacher aides who are bilingual/bicultural or multicultural parents.

H. Bilingual/Bicultural Demonstration Program**

1. Staffing

Administration 11
Bilingual Dem. 2
- Describe the staffing patterns of this component. Describe the responsibilities of staff.

2. Instructional Program

Bilingual Dem. 12
- Does PDC provide the opportunities for children to become bilingual if desired by their family? Include how many classes at each grade level offer second language instruction for both languages.

**To be discussed for Visalia, California; Dilcon, Arizona; Pueblo, Colorado; and Del Rio, Texas.

Bilingual Dem. 8	• Describe the program's philosophies toward bilingual education learning and approaches to teaching.
Bilingual Dem. 9	• Describe the PDC bilingual curriculum and the extent of its use.

3. Services Provided to Children

Bilingual Dem. 3	• Describe how PDC is coordinating special services to meet the educational and social-emotional needs of bilingual children.
Bilingual Dem. 5,10	• Describe the use of bilingual resource persons in the classroom.
Bilingual Dem. 11 Teacher 18d	• Describe the extent of use of bilingual materials and activities.

4. Parent Involvement

Parent 15 Bilingual Dem. 13	• Has the importance of bilingual education been explained to parents?
Bilingual Dem. 19/ Parent 12 Bilingual Dem. 20	• Describe the outreach efforts to parents: - languages of notices;
Bilingual Dem. 21	- availability of interpreters.
Bilingual Dem. 14	• Describe the extent of parent involvement in the selection of the bilingual approach.
Bilingual Dem. 15	• Describe the extent of parent involvement on the PDC Council.
Bilingual Dem. 17/ Bilingual Dem. 16	• Describe the extent of parent involvement in the classroom; as volunteers, as aides.
Bilingual Dem. 18 Parent 13	• Describe the bilingual/bicultural non-training activities of parents.

5. Training

Bilingual Dem. 6

- Describe the teaching staff(s) familiarity with methods of evaluating the cognitive, linguistic, and social-emotional progress of bilingual children.

Bilingual Dem. 7

- Describe the training in specialized bilingual teaching skills and instructional approaches.

Bilingual Dem. 4

- Describe the training activities to make staff sensitive to the needs of bilingual children.

V. SUMMARY

The summary should be composed of a concise statement of the most important aspects of each program component. In essence, it is a brief description of the findings. It should not be a judgment of what occurred, but merely a description.